

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/602,446	06/24/2003	Kelly S. Stack	STK-001	9380	
47713 ІМРЕКПІМ Р.	7590 02/12/2007 ATENT WORKS	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 587		SONNETT, K	SONNETT, KATHLEEN C		
SUNOL, CA 9	4586		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3731		
					
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/602,446	STACK, KELLY S.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kathleen Sonnett	3731		

	Kathleen Sonnett	3731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this. A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			(DTOL 224)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wivided below or appended.	ll be entered and an	explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	ghul GLENN K. DAR	, npg/40/ft 8
		PRIMARY E	· •

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments filed on 1/16/2007 have the added limitation of a non-absorbent material which would require further consideration and search and therefore will not be entered.

The examiner would like to address the following arguments: Applicant argues that the device of McKay (U.S. 5,305,470) would never be used on an infant because it is used for competitive sports. However, the device of McKay is used for cooling the wearer and one would be motivated to use the device any time that a wearer is overheated. This is not limited to overheating associated with competitive sports. Infants and small children may become overheated on a hot day or if they have a fever.

Applicant also argues that the device of McKay as modified by Wilson does not make obvious attaching the device to an infant's wrist and only discloses attaching the device to a child's wrist. The examiner believes applicant's interpretation of child as mentioned in Wilson (U.S. 2004/0098073) is too narrow. No ages are indicated in the instant specification for the term "infant" and it seems to the examiner that a 1 or 2 year old, for example, could be called a child or an infant.

Furthermore, no indication of the fit of the bracelet or any dimensions are present in the claims. For example, independent claim 1 only indicates that the bracelet is "adapted to be attached around an infant's wrist". If the device of McKay as modified Wilson can attach to a child's wrist, it can be put around an infant's wrist. Also, the wrist of a very small three or four-year old may be the same size as the wrist of a large 18-month old.

Applicant also argues that there is nothing in the references of McKay or Wilson that suggests sucking on the capsules which fill the device. However, the language "adapted to be sucked on" means that it can be sucked on and therefore limits the device only so far as that the user can suck on the device. With this language, the references do not need to disclose the step of sucking on the capsules. Regarding the method claim 11, the limitation of the actual step of sucking on the capsule is not included, only that it "is adapted to allow the infant to suck on the capsule".

The device of McKay and Wilson has pea size capsules ([0042] of Wilson) and even when covered by material, can certainly be sucked on through the fabric. It is noted that the phrase "adapted to be sucked on" does not add any size limitation. In other words, a person can suck on their arm or a breath-mint. Sucking on something is not limited to having the entire item in your mouth.